

REMARKS

Initially, the Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for various courtesies extended to Applicant's representative in scheduling the telephone interview of April 25th.

The Office Action mailed February 28, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 12 and 27 have been amended. Claims 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 22, 29, 31-33 and 37 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced.

§102(b) and §103(a) REJECTIONS

The Office Action provides the following observations regarding the scope of the workpiece claims:

Regarding claim 10, the limitations of this claim are met since the claim is directed to the workpiece which contains, at most, only a residual amount of solvent. Therefore, the concentration of the dye in the solvent prior to deposition does not effect the final product since the solvent is evaporated off during the formation of the product. (page 3, second full paragraph).

Jones et al. teach all the limitations of claim 37, as outlined above, *except for the concentration of dye in the coating solution.* (emphasis added) (page 4, numbered

paragraph 3).

Furthermore, since the solvent is not present in the weldable workpiece, the concentration of dye in the solvent is immaterial to the claimed product because the solvent is not present in the product of claim 10. (page 6, second paragraph).

These quotations indicate that the coating solution has been evaluated for its contribution to the invention. In order to clarify the materiality of its role, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 12 and 27 to positively recite a liquid solution in combination with a workpiece. In conjunction with this change, the recitation of dye concentration in claims 10 and 37 has been incorporated into the independent claims. To better explain the relationship between concentration and deposited density, the features of surface tension and drying time effecting the defined edge of the welding zone have been included from page 11 of the specification, lines 13 – 15. The description of the welding zone as being laminar in claim 27, is now present in all the independent claims. The nature of the workpiece has also been modified to import the “reflective surface” feature from claims 12 – 21, 24, 25 into the independent claims. No new matter has been entered.

The amended claims recite elements and features which address the particular problem of applying a liquid solution to a reflective surface, as compared to a porous fabric. Fabrics can absorb and contain liquids whereby varying quantities can be applied to achieve a desired dye density. Any suggestion to apply an unadulterated liquid to a reflective surface would likely fail to produce a laminar welding zone with a defined edge

and a uniform density throughout the zone.

Accordingly, the amended claims recite a particular concentration of dye within the liquid solution that is modified as to its viscosity, surface tension and drying time to achieve the particularly claimed target density. The reference controls the deposition of dye onto bulk substrates by employing a film, which exists in a solid phase. The prior Office Action already acknowledges that the reference fails to teach the concentration of dye in the coating solution. In conclusion, the reference does not suggest modifying the acetone solvent as to concentration or other characteristics for application onto a “reflective” surface “to provide a substantially laminar welding zone with a defined edge”, as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 1, 12 and 27 are believed to be patentable and nonobvious over Jones for at least the reasons stated above. Claims 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 22, 29, 31-33 and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 2 and 9 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 1. Claims 13-21 and claims 23-26 depend from claim 12 and claims 28, 30, 34-36 and 38-40 depend from claim 27. As such, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claims 1, 12 and 27.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 12-21, 23-28, 30, 34-36 and 38-40 are patentable and nonobvious over the cited reference. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application. Such early and favorable consideration by the Examiner is respectfully urged. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to Applicant's representative's Deposit Account No. 50-1433.

Respectfully submitted,
KEUSEY, TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C.

By: Edwin H. Keusey
Edwin H. Keusey
Reg. No. 34,361

Date: April 27, 2005

Mailing Address:

14 Vanderventer Avenue, Suite 128
Port Washington, New York 11050
Tel: (516) 883-3868
Fax: (516) 883-3869